

Memorandum to the File  
 Alleged Preferential Treatment  
 VA Central Office VHA  
 Washington, D.C.  
 (2014-04373-IQ-0128)

The VA Office of Inspector General Administrative Investigations Division conducted a preliminary investigation into allegations that Mr. (b) (7)(C) (SES), (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C), hired his mistress, (b) (7)(C), then promoted her to a position she was not qualified for. In addition, they traveled together on VA business and used VA funding to support their sexual relationship. Mr. (b) (7)(C) and Ms. (b) (7)(C) were in Phoenix together during the week of (b) (7)(C). To assess these allegations we reviewed Fed Travel records, EOPFs as well as Federal laws, regulations, and VA policy.

5 U.S. Code § 2302 prevents granting any preference or advantage not authorized by law, rule, or regulation to any employee or applicant for employment (including defining the scope or manner of competition or the requirements for any position) for the purpose of improving or injuring the prospects of any particular person for employment.

An employee should recognize their responsibility to protect and conserve government property and resources, and to make an honest effort to use official time and government property only for official business. 5 C.F.R. § 2635.704 through .705

We identified four dates when Mr. (b) (7)(C) and Ms. (b) (7)(C) were both on official travel. On two of those occasions, they were on travel to different locations. For example, in (b) (7)(C), she traveled to Portland, OR, while he was on travel to New Orleans, LA. In (b) (7)(C), she was on travel to Madison, WI, and he was on travel to Martinsburg, WV, and Washington, DC.

In (b) (7)(C), they were both in Oklahoma City, OK, for a conference (b) (7)(C). She was there for 2 nights, and he was there for 5 nights. Travel records reflected that there were numerous other HR employees who also traveled to that location during those dates.

In (b) (7)(C), they were both on travel to Dallas, TX, for (b) (7)(C) site visit, and they were both in Dallas for 3 nights. However, travel records reflected another (b) (7)(C) employee was also there to assist with the Dallas VAMC (b) (7)(C) audit.

Travel records reflected that Mr. (b) (7)(C) traveled to Phoenix in (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C), and (b) (7)(C); however, travel records reflected that Ms. (b) (7)(C) has never traveled to Phoenix.

Personnel records reflected that Ms. (b) (7)(C) was selected for promotion from a certificate of eligibles. Although we cannot definitely conclude whether Mr. (b) (7)(C) and Ms. (b) (7)(C) are

or are not involved in an inappropriate personal relationship, there is no evidence that they arranged travel to be together or misused VA funds to support their alleged relationship.

On the advice of the Assistant Inspector General for Investigations and the Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Investigations, we are closing this preliminary investigation without any further action.

Prepared By

[REDACTED]

Approved By

[REDACTED]